



CLIMATE CHANGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

December 8, 2009

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, December 8, 2009, 2:00 PM at 2160 N. 6th Ave. at the Northwest Neighborhood Center, Tucson, Arizona.

Primary CCC Members in Attendance

- Phil Swaim, Swaim Associates
- Paul Green, Tucson Audubon Society
- Pat Patton, UA Eller School of Business
- Jane Poynter, Paragon Space Development Corp
- Varga Garland, Community Food Bank
- Andy Laurenzi, Center for Desert Archeology
- Joanie Sawyer, PRO Neighborhoods
- Tomas Leon, Community Foundation for Southern Arizona
- Jonathan Overpeck, UA Institute for the Study of Planet Earth
- James McAdam, Watershed Management Group

Alternate CCC Members in Attendance

- Barbara Warren, Physicians for Social Responsibility
- Neil Markowitz, Environmental Education Exchange
- Bryant Nodine, TUSD
- Julie Evans, Native Seeds/SEARCH

Staff in Attendance

- David Schaller, Office of Conservation and Sustainable Development (OCSD)
- Nicole Urban-Lopez, OCSD
- Holly Lachowicz, Ward 3

Public in Attendance

- Lee Comrie, PAG
- Sue Cotty, PAG
- Ruth Reiman, PAG
- Susan Culp, Sonoran Institute
- Julie Cole, UA
- Virginia Rich, UA
- Tedra Fox, Pima County
- Donna Branch-Gilby
- Joe Abraham

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

- A quorum was established and the meeting commenced at 2:15 p.m.

2. Welcome and Introductions

3. Approval of Minutes for November 10, 2009

- Andy Laurenzi moved to approve the November 10, 2009 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Jonathan Overpeck. Motion passed unanimously by a voice vote of 10 to 0.

4. Legislative and Regulatory Updates

- David Schaller reported that staff provided a report to Mayor and Council on the CCC during the study session on November 24, 2009.
- The EPA issued endangerment finding under the Clean Air Act which allows them to regulate greenhouse gas emissions as a pollutant.
- Barbara Warren reported that the ACC approved rules to require Arizona electric utilities to demonstrate how they will evaluate and cost out externalities including impact on water, human health, and the environment. Water used in energy generation and emissions generated will be reported. They are also required to identify how they will comply with energy demand, energy efficiency and the state renewable energy standard.

5. General Updates

- Jonathan Overpeck commented on the recent news coverage regarding stolen emails from climate scientists discussing research findings related to global warming. The stolen emails included some from the UA laboratory and the UK. The content of the emails do not change the content of the climate science that has been published and most governments involved in international climate talks agree.
- It was asked what the significance of the medieval warm period is. Dr. Overpeck explained that the medieval warm period was thought to be a time when the globe was warmer than it is today and if that's true, people argue that humans can't be causing the current warming. Overpeck and other scientists proved that it was not a warmer period than it is today. Instrumental data was overlaid with tree ring data during the research conducted. Numerical indications of certainty are included in everything submitted to the IPCC.
- David reported that the CIA is opening a Special Center on Climate Change.

6. Final Report on the Green House Gas Mitigation Measures Analysis Project with the University of Arizona

- Dr. Julie Cole from the University of Arizona presented the results of the GHG mitigation measures analysis.
- The measures were divided into 4 categories: commercial, residential, transportation, and municipal.
- The project reports include an assessment of the amount of CO₂e that would be reduced by each measure as a percent of the City's goal of 2,678,000 metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions.
- Many measures achieve less than 1% of the overall goal, though there may be ancillary benefits beyond the carbon impact so these measures may still be useful for adoption.
- Some measures have emissions reductions that accumulate over time and others have a one-time savings.
- The UA students were asked to be conservative with their participation estimates so the emissions savings would not be over-estimated.
- 21 measures were selected as the best options for achieving GHG reductions.
- It was noted that the percent reductions may be overestimated by 15-20% because some of the larger measures overlap with other measures so the emissions savings are counted twice.
- The implementation strategies should be considered to better estimate participation rates for each measure.
- Instructors still have to grade the individual analyses and determine what further analysis needs to be done on each measure. Julie will distribute a copy of the assumptions that were made for each measure. There is a write-up on each measure that will also be given to staff.
- Next steps are to refine assumptions, confirm the calculations, and evaluate the accrued benefits of the measures.

- It was asked whether we should be reducing from current emissions or emissions from a normal economy.
- In Arizona, overall emissions have increased but per capita emissions have not increased.
- It was commented that the emissions calculations are based on a system with no carbon trading, but that may change.
- A comment was made that the MCPA goal was established in response to a federal government that wasn't doing anything, so the Committee shouldn't get caught up in the emissions reduction numbers.
- The Committee needs to consider and include reductions from other policies that are occurring outside the work of the CCC, such as the ACC's renewable energy standard. There are different GHG scenarios depending on the economy, ACC/TEP, etc.
- It was commented that we shouldn't leave out measures with low GHG reductions that engage the public because they are still good from a community education perspective even if they are low on carbon impact.
- The community needs to embrace climate change mitigation the way it embraced water conservation, as a personal responsibility we all have.
- We should take advantage of the economy as a teaching opportunity and look at the larger effects of the mitigation measures.

7. City of Phoenix Climate Action Planning Process

- Gaye Knight and Phil McNeely provided a presentation followed by discussion which is summarized below.
- The City of Phoenix adopted a government GHG emissions reduction goal of 5% below 2005 by 2015. The Mayor and Council also signed onto the MCPA.
- The GHG reduction plan only includes government operations because it is difficult to control transportation and they don't have their own electric utility.
- They chose a realistic goal vs. an aspirational goal- to maintain the public trust.
- A departmental inventory showed that 80 related programs were already in place.
- The GHG inventory didn't include buildings the city owns but does not operate such as public housing.
- Projections showed an expected 14% GHG growth between 2005-2015, modeled with a 2% population growth per year.
- The Phoenix Mayor has a new 17 point plan for the community to achieve carbon neutrality which will make it the first city to be carbon neutral.
- Phoenix is developing voluntary green building code but they can't give cash incentives because of budget cuts.
- There has been some discussion of developing a community GHG reduction plan through the Maricopa Association of Governments.
- It was clarified that the light rail isn't in the action plan because it isn't run by the City of Phoenix.
- Links: climateactionmap.org
phoenix.gov/sustainability

8. Discussion of Measures Review/Selection Process and Timeline

- Staff distributed copies of a draft Climate Mitigation Measures Review Process.
- Staff will add a column for co-benefits and unintended consequences.
- The data in the matrix needs to be cleaned-up before a cost analysis is completed.
- Concerns were raised that even if all the measures are implemented, the still won't reach the GHG reduction goal. Staff indicated that some of the assumptions that the numbers are based on need to be changed and the measures don't account for City projects that are affecting emissions.
- It was suggested that we go back and look at the original list of measures to see if others should be considered.
- Concerns were raised about credibility if the evaluation numbers aren't calculated well.

9. Discussion and Creation of Subcommittees

- No discussion or action was taken.

10. Future Agenda Items

- Discussion of Stakeholder Input
- Presentation from Tucson Water

11. Call to the Audience

- Susanne Cotty commented about target year GHG savings vs. cumulative projected year savings.

12. Adjournment